



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/694,176	10/28/2003	Kazuo Saito	0171-1032P	2737
2292	7590	10/06/2005	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH			ORTIZ, ANGELA Y	
PO BOX 747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			1732	

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/694,176	SAITO ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Angela Ortiz	1732	

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 October 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 28 October 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/691,213.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/28/03.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The title should be limited to the method, as only method claims are presented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to claims 1-4, the term "pbw" is not defined in the claims; such renders the claims indefinite, as it is readable on both percentage and parts by weight, and would make infringement reasons unclear.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito et al., USP 6,242,124 or USP 6,444,344 in view of Fukuda et al., USP 5,236,687 (all of record).

Either cited primary reference substantially teaches the basic claimed method of molding a fuel cell separator by combining carbonaceous material with a resin material, and optional additives. In USP 6,444,344, the fuel cell separator can be molded by combining 100 parts by weight graphite material with 5-50 parts by weight of resin. The molding method comprises any conventional molding technique (claim 1) including injection molding (claim 2). See col. 2, lines 1-10, 50-60; and col. 3, lines 5-15. USP 6,242,124 teaches combining 100 parts by weight graphite material with 10-45 parts by weight thermosetting resin. The mixture is then molded conventionally, including either transfer molding or injection molding (claims 1 and 2). See col. 5, lines 1-25.

Neither cited primary reference teaches the claimed 3-35 pbw of fibrous material, or orienting the material at 60-120 degrees with respect to the thickness direction of the molded product.

The added secondary reference teaches as conventional the feature of molding a fuel cell substrate comprising providing carbonaceous material, a resin binder, and additional components including solid particles for promoting orientation of the fibers during molding. The detailed method includes providing a conventional carbon/resin mixture, wherein solid particles, preferably carbon fibers, are added in the amount of 5-40% by weight. The solid particles are added to orient the fibers in the thickness direction of the product and make the composition more uniform in the rib portion of the product. The orientation improves electric and thermal conductivity of the carbon material. See col. 5, lines 43-44; col. 6, lines 53-70; col. 7, lines 1-5, 18-20, 35-40.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to so include a fibrous material, and orient the material in the thickness direction of the product as taught in the added reference, when performing the process set forth in either primary reference, for forming a product with improved electric and thermal conductivity.

Note that 5-40% by weight as taught in the added reference is deemed readable on the claimed 3-35 pbw; nonetheless, such an amount would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for providing the desired improved conductivity.

With respect to claims 3-4, note that the degree of orientation chosen is well known and well within the level of ordinary skill in the art; it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select any desired degree of orientation for achieving the improved conductivity rates.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. USP's 3573086; 5024877; 5409589; 6884538.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Angela Ortiz whose telephone number is 571-272-1206. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 9:00-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Colaianni can be reached on 571-272-1196. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Angela Ortiz
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1732

ao